IFW ~~AF~~

PTO/SB/21 (01-08)
Approved for use through 05/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

IAP07
AUG 0 4 2008

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	10/677,239
Filing Date	October 3, 2003
First Named Inventor	William Earl RUSSELL et al.
Art Unit	3714
Examiner Name	Kesha Frisby
Attorney Docket Number	24GA5997 (8564-000043/US)
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	

ENCLOSURES *(check all that apply)*

- ☒ Fee Transmittal Form
  - ☒ Fee Attached
- ☐ Amendment / Reply
  - ☐ After Final
  - ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
  - ☐ Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53
- ☐ Drawing(s)
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) _____
- ☐ After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☒ Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, **Brief**, Reply Brief)
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☐ Other Enclosure(s) *(please identify below)*:

Remarks: The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 08-0750. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

MAILSTOP: Appeal Briefs - Patents

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.		
Signature			
Printed name	Ryan E. Alley		
Date	August 4, 2008	Reg. No.	60,977

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name		Express Mail Label No.	
Signature		Date	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

HDP/SB/17 (09-07)
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2008

Effective 2/8/2006. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT ($) 510

Complete if Known	
Application Number	10/677,239
Filing Date	October 3, 2003
First Named Inventor	William RUSSELL II et al.
Examiner Name	Kesha Frisby
Art Unit	3714
Attorney Docket No.	24GA5997 (8564-000043/US)

AUG 0 4 2008
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

METHOD OF PAYMENT *(check all that apply)*

☒ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None

☒ Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number	08-0750
Deposit Account Name	

The Director is authorized to: *(check all that apply)*

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☒ Credit any overpayments
☐ Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application
☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, **except for the filing fee**
to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1011	310	2011	155	Utility filing fee	
1012	210	2012	105	Design filing fee	
1013	210	2013	105	Plant filing fee	
1014	310	2014	155	Reissue filing fee	
1005	210	2005	105	Provisional filling fee	

SUBTOTAL (1) ($) 0

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

				Extra Claims		Fee from below		Fee Paid
Total Claims		- **	=	0	X		=	0
Independent Claims		- **	=	0	X		=	0
Multiple Dependent							=	0

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description
1202	50	2202	25	Claims in excess of 20
1201	210	2201	105	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	370	2203	185	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	210	2204	105	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	50	2205	25	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) ($) 0

***or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above*

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.	
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification	
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for reexamination	
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251	120	2251	60	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	460	2252	230	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	1,050	2253	525	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,640	2254	820	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	2,230	2255	1,115	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	510	2401	255	Notice of Appeal	
1402	510	2402	255	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	510
1403	1,030	2403	515	Request for oral hearing	
1452	510	2452	255	Petition to revive – unavoidable	
1453	1,540	2453	770	Petition to revive – unintentional	
1462	400	1462	400	Petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(f)	
1463	200	1463	200	Petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(g)	
1464	130	1464	130	Petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(h)	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17 (q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809	810	2809	405	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
1810	810	2810	405	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	
1801	810	2801	405	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid SUBTOTAL (3) ($)510

4. SEARCH/EXAMINATION FEES

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1111	510	2111	255	Utility Search Fee	
1112	100	2112	50	Design Search Fee	
1113	310	2113	155	Plant Search Fee	
1114	510	2114	255	Reissue Search Fee	
1311	210	2311	105	Utility Examination Fee	
1312	130	2312	65	Design Examination Fee	
1313	160	2313	80	Plant Examination Fee	
1314	620	2314	310	Reissue Examination Fee	

SUBTOTAL (4) ($)0

SUBMITTED BY Complete *(if applicable)*

Name (Print/Type)	Ryan E. Alley	*Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)*	60,977	*Telephone*	703-668-8000
Signature				*Date*	August 4, 2008

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

OIPE AP87
AUG 04 2008
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT
144781-1 (8564-000083/US)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	William RUSSELL II et al.	Conf.:	9110
Appl. No.:	10/677,239	Group:	3714
Filed:	October 3, 2003	Examiner:	Kesha Frisby

For: METHOD FOR PREDICTED REACTOR SIMULATION

Docket No.: 24GA5997 (8564-000043/US)

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents

August 4, 2008

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, Appellants submit the following:

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST:

The real party in interest in this appeal is Global Nuclear Fuel - Americas. Assignment of the application was submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on May 10, 2004, and recorded on the same date at Reel 014586, Frame 0742.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

No related appeals or interferences are known.

08/05/2008 JADDO1 00000058 10677239
01 FC:1402 510.00 OP

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS:

Claims 1-34 are pending and currently stand rejected. Claim 35 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 19, and 34 are independent claims. The claims are rejected as follows:

1. Claims 1-4, 6-21, and 23-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP Pub 1113457 to Russell ("Russell").

2. Claims 5 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of US Pat 3,919,720 to Alliston ("Alliston").

Claims 1-34 are being appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS:

No amendments after the closing of prosecution have been submitted, and all previous amendments have been entered. The claims are presented and appealed in their form at the closing of prosecution.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER:

The following explains the subject matter set forth in each claim argued on appeal and each independent claim by way of example embodiments in the specification by page and line number, and in the drawings, if any, by reference characters only to satisfy 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). This concise explanation relies on example embodiments from the specification to describe the claims; however, the claims recite subject matter not limited to these example embodiments. Independent claims 1, 19, and 34 are representative and discussed below.

Claim 1

Example embodiments include methods of simulating nuclear reactor performance by using an existing response surface. A response surface is a polynomial correlation between independent control variables and dependent performance variables. The independent control variables, also called design inputs, represent operational controls that may be directly modified by the plant operators (for example, control rod positioning). The dependent performance variables, also called operational outputs, represent reactor parameters not directly set by plant operators (for example, critical power ratio or average core thermal power). The recitation in claim 1 of, "the response surface defining relationships between the design inputs and operational outputs of at least one or more aspects of a core design," read on this definition of a response surface and may be found in the specification as filed ("spec"), page 11, lines 20-31[1]. While the method of generating an existing response surface is not claimed, example methods discuss and enable response surface generation from a series of initial independent control variable inputs and conventional computer-implemented reactor simulations using these inputs at spec, page 9, line 31 through page 12, line 18.

---

[1] Note that the page and line numbering of the Specification as filed on October 3, 2003, which is cited herein, does not necessarily correspond to the pages and line numbering of the application as published.

A user may perform example methods by inputting values for independent control variables that were used in creating a response surface, as discussed above. For example, a user may input numerical values for control rod position, core flow rate, and/or any other variable used in initially creating the response surface into a computer or other processing device. The computer or network may store and/or access a corresponding existing response surface generated at any previous point in time. There are no limits on the user input; they are at a user's discretion and may reflect a current reactor's operational settings or be completely arbitrary. Accordingly, values in user input may be similar to or vastly different from the values for independent control variables used in creating the existing response surface. The recitation in claim 1 of, "receiving user input including values of one or more design input variables previously used in creating an existing response surface" read on this example embodiment step and may be found in the spec at page 26, line 5 through page 27, line 16.

Once the user has input the desired independent control variable values, the computer or other processing device may generate reactor performance variable values from the response surface combined with the input independent control variable values. The computer may then display, print out, chart, or otherwise make available the generated reactor performance values in order to provide a reactor simulation. For example, a processor may substitute the input values for control rod position, fuel location, etc., into the stored response surface polynomial to calculate corresponding dependent performance values for critical power ratio, electrical power generation, etc. The recitation in claim 1 of, "generating a reactor simulation based on the existing response surface for the core design and the received user input" read on this example embodiment step and may be found in the spec at page 27, line 16 through page 28, line 22.

Claim 19

Example methods may include user input of several independent control variable values or sets thereof and generation of multiple sets of dependent performance values, which may be charted or otherwise compared to illustrate differences across several different inputs. The recitation in claim 19 of, "inputting values of one or more of the design inputs; receiving one or more reactor simulation results for a reactor simulation of the existing response surface with the input values" read on this example method step and may be found in the spec at page 26, line 5 through page 28, line 22. The remaining limitations of claim 19 are substantially similar to those of claim 1 and may be found as indicated above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 34

Example methods may include operating a nuclear reactor based on the real-time simulation results generated by an existing response surface and user input. For example, a reactor operator may input proposed operational changes, such as control rod movement, and a networked processor may provide real-time simulated reactor response to such changes through the existing response surface. The operator may then implement or otherwise operate the nuclear reactor in accordance with the input values and simulation results, without waiting for lengthy conventional simulation results. The recitation in claim 34 of, "operating a nuclear reactor using a reactor simulation generated based on an existing response surface for a core design and input received from a user" read on this example method step and may be found in the spec at page 28, lines 15-22. The remaining limitations of claim 34 are substantially similar to those of claim 1 and may be found as indicated above with regard to claim 1.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL:

Appellant seeks the Board's review of the following rejections:

1. The rejection to claims 1-4, 6-21, and 23-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP Pub 1113457 to Russell ("Russell").

2. The rejection to claims 5 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of US Pat 3,919,720 to Alliston ("Alliston").

Claims 1-34 rise and fall together.

VII. ARGUMENTS:

A. CLAIMS 1-4, 6-21, AND 23-34 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY RUSSELL.

With regard to claims 1, 19, and 34, the Examiner alleges that Russell teaches each and every element of these claims, including "receiving user input including values of one or more design input variables" and "generating a reactor simulation based on the existing response surface for the core design and the received user input" by its polynomial optimization and evaluation module 304, illustrated in FIG. 7. *See* Final Office Action dated December 20, 2007, pp. 2, 6; Advisory Action dated April 9, 2008, p. 2. Applicants respectfully submit that the Russell does not teach these claim elements.

1. Principles of Law

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. *See* Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 713 F.2d 760, 771 (Fed.Cir.1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1026, (1984). Claims are interpreted at examination as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. *See* In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2004). Whether anticipation of the claims as interpreted exists is a factual decision made by the Examiner. *See* Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco, Inc., 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The BPAI must "review adverse decisions of Examiners upon applications for patents," including decisions of claim interpretation and anticipation. 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

2. Russell does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1, 19, or 34.

Applicants respectfully submit that Russell does not teach "receiving user input including values of one or more design input variables previously used in creating an existing response surface" and "generating a reactor simulation based on the existing response surface for the core design and the received user input" under any interpretation of Russell and the quoted elements of claims 1, 19, and 34.

Russell is Applicants' own art and is directed toward creating and calibrating a response surface, which was itself a new concept and term created by Russell. *See* Russell Col. 5, l. 55 – Col. 6, l. 26. Once created, the response surface in Russell is used to predict values of dependent performance variables across a predetermined set, or breadth, of independent control variable values. *See* Russell, Col. 18, ll. 40-54. These independent control variable values are not input by a user; rather, the entire range of permissible values for each independent control variable is used by the program in Russell, regardless of initial user input. *See* Russell, Col. 18, ll. 51-54. Russell then uses an objective function to discriminate among the several predicted values and determine a corresponding optimized set of independent control variables out of the previously-used entire range. *See* Russell, Col. 20, ll. 6-11. The use of the existing response surface as a simulator *based on specific user input* values to show nuclear plant reaction to specific user input, as fairly recited by the "existing response surface" and use of "user input," is disclosed only in the present application as shown by the following discussion.

The step of "receiving user input including values of one or more design input variables **previously used** in creating an **existing** response surface" is not found in Russell. Instead, Russell teaches user input containing design input variables only to generate the **initial** response surface, where the input variables are **used for the first time**. *See* Russell, Col. 8, ll. 34-38; Col. 9, ll. 28-38; FIG. 2, element 201 (initial user input) before element 219 (response surface creation). Further, in the section relied upon by the Examiner for teaching the "receiving user input including **values**," Russell teaches user input of only a **quantity** of design input variables to be combined in the later response surface use of the entire set of independent control variables, not actual values for those variables:

> a user of the present system may select an optimization "resolution" level as input option that permits changes to quantitative operational values for more than one independent control variable to be evaluated in combination with each other . . . The higher the selected resolution level, the **more independent control variables** are evaluated together in combination and, hence, the greater the probability of detecting a combination that will improve reactor performance. For example, at a selected optimization resolution of **"three"**, a change in the quantitative values for **three different independent control variables** and every combination of three control-variables out of the total number of control-variables considered would be evaluated. Russell, Col. 19, ll. 7-30 (emphasis added)

This is not a user inputting a **value** of a design variable, for example, a control blade position or core flow rate, into a simulation based on an existing response surface in Russell. Thus, Russell lacks the user input of design input variables as recited in the claims.

Further, the step of "simulation **based on an existing response surface** for the core design **and the received user input**" is also missing from Russell, because Russell is concerned with generating and using the response surface for a set range of independent control variable values, not with user inputs. Where Russell discloses a simulation based on received user input, it is in the generation of the initial response surface and **based on conventional reactor core simulators**, including conventional 3-D simulators, not with a response surface, which does not exist at that point. *See* Russell, Col. 9, ll. 22-36; Col. 10, ll. 11-58 (creation); Col. 20; ll. 23-44 (calibration). Thus, Russell lacks the usage of an existing response surface as a simulator for user input recited in the claims.

Because Russell fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 19, and 34, Russell cannot anticipate or render obvious claims 1, 19, and 34. Claims 2-4, 6-18, 20, 21, and 23-33 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Reversal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to claims 1-4, 6-21, and 23-34 is respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 5 AND 22 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER RUSSELL IN VIEW OF ALLISTON.

While claims 5 and 22 are not argued separately, Applicants note that reversal of the rejection to claims 1, 19, and 34 equally requires reversal of the rejection to claims 5 and 22, by virtue of their dependency from allowable base claims and because Alliston does not cure the disclosure and suggestion deficiencies of Russell discussed above. *See* In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ("Dependent claims are nonobvious under section 103 if the independent claims from which they depend are nonobvious."). Specifically, Alliston does not disclose, nor does the Examiner apply Alliston for disclosing, "receiving user input including values of one or more design input variables previously used in creating an existing response surface" or "generating a reactor simulation based on the existing response surface for the core design and the received user input." Because Russell, alone or in combination with Alliston, still does not disclose each and every element of claims 1, 19, and 34, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claims 1, 19, and 34. Claims 5 and 22 are allowable at least for depending from allowable base claims. Reversal of the rejections to claims 5 and 22 under § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

C. CONCLUSION

In light of the above arguments, the Board is respectfully requested to review and overturn the rejections to claims 1-34 in connection with this application.

The Commissioner is authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b), particularly, Appeal Brief fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By________________________
Ryan Alley, Reg. No. 60,977
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/REA:tlt

VIII. APPENDIX A - Listing of claims 1-34 on appeal:

1. (Previously Presented) A method for reactor simulation, comprising:

receiving user input including values of one or more design input variables previously used in creating an existing response surface, the response surface defining relationships between the design inputs and operational outputs of at least one or more aspects of a core design; and

generating a reactor simulation based on the existing response surface for the core design and the received user input.

2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising: accessing the existing response surface for the core design from a database.

3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the user input includes at least one of control blades positions over time, bundle types of fresh fuel, loading pattern of exposed fuel, and water flow through the reactor core.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the operational outputs include at least one of critical power ratio (CPR), shutdown margin (SDM), maximum average planar linear heat generation rate (MAPLHGR), maximum fraction of linear power density (MFLPD), hot excess reactivity, radial and axial power peaking, peak fuel rod and bundle exposure, Uranium utilization as measured by reactor energy output produced (in mega-watt-days) per kilogram of Uranium-235 loaded.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the generating step generates the reactor simulation in real time.

6. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the existing response surface includes information defining a plurality of predictors, each predictor predicting one of the operational outputs based on one of the design inputs.

7. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 6, wherein the generating step uses one or more predictors associated with the user input to generate new operational outputs.

8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 6, wherein each predictor is one of a second order polynomial and a linear function.

9. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising: providing feedback to the user on the generated reactor simulation.

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 9, wherein the providing step provides an old objective function value for the core design prior to receiving user input and a new objective function value for the core design after receiving user input.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein a same objective function is used to determine the old and new objective function values.

12. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein the same objective function is the objective function used to create the core design.

13. (Original) The method of claim 11, wherein the same objective function is a different objective function than an objective function used to create the core design.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 10, wherein different objective functions are used to determine the old and new object function values.

15. (Original) The method of claim 9, wherein the providing step provides a worst case value for at least one of the operational outputs.

16. (Original) The method of claim 15, wherein the providing step provides the worst case value for one or more operational outputs selected by the user.

17. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the reactor being simulated is a boiling water reactor.

18. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the reactor being simulated is a pressure water reactor.

19. (Previously Presented) A method for obtaining a reactor simulation, comprising:

identifying an existing response surface, the existing response surface defining relationships between design input and operational outputs of at least one or more aspects of a core design;

inputting values of one or more of the design inputs;

receiving one or more reactor simulation results for a reactor simulation of the existing response surface with the input values.

20. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 19, wherein the input values include at least one of control blades positions over time, bundle types of fresh fuel, loading pattern of exposed fuel, and water flow through the reactor core.

21. (Original) The method of claim 19, wherein the operational outputs include at least one of critical power ratio (CPR), shutdown margin (SDM), maximum average planar linear heat generation rate (MAPLHGR), maximum fraction of linear power density (MFLPD), Hot excess reactivity, radial and axial power peaking, peak fuel rod and bundle exposure, Uranium utilization as measured by reactor energy output produced (in mega-watt-days) per kilogram of Uranium-235 loaded.

22. (Original) The method of claim 19, wherein the receiving step receives the reactor simulation results in real time.

23. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 19, wherein the existing response surface includes information defining a plurality of predictors, each predictor predicting one of the operational outputs based on one of the design inputs.

24. (Original) The method of claim 23, wherein each predictor is one of a second order polynomial and a linear function.

25. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 19, wherein the receiving step receives an old objection function value for the core design prior to inputting values of one or more design variables and receives a new objective function value for the core design after inputting values of one or more design variables.

26. (Original) The method of claim 25, wherein a same objective function is used to determine the old and new objective function values.

27. (Original) The method of claim 26, wherein the same objective function is the objective function used to create the core design.

28. (Original) The method of claim 26, wherein the same objective function is a different objective function than an objective function used to create the core design.

29. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 25, wherein different objective functions are used to determine the old and new object function values.

30. (Original) The method of claim 19, wherein the receiving step receives a worst case value for at least one of the operational outputs.

31. (Original) The method of claim 30, wherein the providing step provides the worst case value for one or more operational outputs selected by the user.

32. (Original) The method of claim 19, wherein the reactor being simulated is a boiling water reactor.

33. (Original) The method of claim 19, wherein the reactor being simulated is a pressure water reactor.

34. (Previously Presented) A method of operating a nuclear reactor, comprising:

operating a nuclear reactor using a reactor simulation generated based on an existing response surface for a core design and input received from a user, the input including values of design input variables used in creating the existing response surface, the existing response surface defining relationships between the design input variables and operational outputs of at least one or more aspects of the core design.

IX. APPENDIX B - EVIDENCE SUBMITTED UNDER CFR 1.130, 1.131, OR 1.132

None.

X. APPENDIX C – DECISIONS RENDERED BY THE COURT OR THE BOARD IN RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES SECTION

None.